



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,917	05/17/2006	Yasutaka Kodama	F-8908	6024
28107 7590 07/13/2010 JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP 122 EAST 42ND STREET SUITE 4000 NEW YORK, NY 10168				
EXAMINER				
MATTIA, SCOTT A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3689				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/13/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/560,917

Applicant(s)

KODAMA, YASUTAKA

Examiner

SCOTT A. MATTIA

Art Unit

3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the Amendment/Response filed on 04/26/2010.
2. Claim 1 is currently amended.
3. Claims 2-5 are cancelled.
4. Claim 1 is currently pending and has been examined.
5. Applicant's Remarks/Arguments are addressed at the end of this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda (5859778) in view of Fujimoto (2003/0211885). Kuroda relates to a system for remotely managing a machine by means of a central control apparatus such as a personal computer or the like by connecting the machine controlled by a control device, e.g., a micro-computer with the central control apparatus via communication means. Fujimoto relates to a system of improved monitoring function against wrong or fraudulent acts, and a particularly, a game facility monitoring system comprising a plurality of game machines or game-related devices provided with detecting means that detects the state of a device and the operation of the device resulting from wrong or fraudulent acts.
9. **CLAIM 1 (Currently Amended)** – Kuroda discloses a coin laundry management system comprising:
- a coin laundry device (“a plurality of clothes-washers and a plurality of dryers installed are used by the payment with coins”, Kuroda, col. 1, lines 16-18)
 - a control device that controls the operation of the coin laundry device based on the coin laundry device data received from various sensors (“operations of a plurality of laundry machines such as clothes-washers and dryers set in the laundrettes are controlled by a microcomputer that takes in signals from rotational speed sensors, thermistors, micro switches, and the like respectively installed in several parts of each machine”, Kuroda, col. 1, lines 30-34; “microcomputer controls the operations of the laundry machine according to the signals received from the sensors”, col. 1, lines 40-41)
 - a data controller that sends the data from the control device (“microcomputer ... transmits the data to a data controller (hereinafter called as the DTC)”, Kuroda, col. 1,

lines 40-44)

- a coin laundry store where the coin laundry device, the data controller and the network camera are provided (“In a laundrette, for example, wherein a plurality of clothes-washers and a plurality of dryers installed are used by the payment with coins”, Kuroda, col. 1, lines 16-18; i.e., a self-service laundry facility, or laundromat)
- a central control device that is connected to the data controller via a line of communication (“Each DTC [data controller] is connected to the central control apparatus using a personal computer disposed in a management company via a public telephone line”, Kuroda, col. 1, lines 46-48; i.e., the telephone line represents a line of communication connecting the data controller (DTC) and central control apparatus.), the central control device being located at a site other than the coin laundry store (“a *remote* management system that makes it possible to change data stored in a memory in a control device of a machine which stores related data to the operation of the machine from a remote central control apparatus of a management company, without dispatching personnel to the site of the machine”, Kuroda, col. 2, lines 36-41; i.e., “remote” system implies located somewhere other than the store); and
- the coin laundry device controlled remotely (“a *remote* management system that makes it possible to change data stored in a memory in a control device of a machine which stores related data to the operation of the machine from a remote central control apparatus of a management company, without dispatching personnel to the site of the machine”, Kuroda, col. 2, lines 36-41; “central control apparatus gives a screen display”, Kuroda, col. 2, lines 1-2) based on coin laundry device data and the moving images of the coin

laundry store that are sent to the central control device from the data controller and the network camera via a line of communication (“remotely managing a machine by means of a central control apparatus such as a personal computer or the like by connecting the machine controlled by a control device, e.g., a micro-computer with the central control apparatus via communication means”, Kuroda, col. 1, lines 8-13; and “wherein a plurality of clothes-washers and a plurality of dryers installed are used by the payment with coins or prepaid cards, when a management system that carries out centralized monitoring of the laundry machine to check the presence of failures, presence of troubles, and the sales amount and other information thereby to control the machine”, col. 1, lines 16-22); wherein the system facilitates real-time control of a condition in and around the coin laundry store in which an administrator, in real time, can review data captured in real time, and in response to the images, implement corrected action, whereby urgent conditions can be addressed in a prompt and appropriate manner (Note, this amended language does not impart a structural modification to the claimed system. Rather, the language describes an intended use for the system. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As such, the language does not serve as to distinguish the claim against the prior art. Nevertheless, Kuroda teaches: “in the event of a trouble such as a failure, an abnormality of the machine, stealing of the sales or the like, the microcomputer of the laundry machine in trouble stops the operation of the machine and outputs a transmission request for the central control apparatus to the DTC. When the DTC makes a response, the

microcomputer transmits data notifying the occurrence of the trouble to the DTC. The DTC calls the central control apparatus in order to transmit the received trouble data and, when the central control apparatus responds, transmits the data indicating the occurrence of the trouble. Upon receipt of the data, the central control apparatus gives a screen display, an alarm, etc., to inform the personnel of the trouble being occurred”, Kuroda, col. 1, line 57 to col. 2, line 2)

Kuroda does not explicitly disclose:

- a network camera that converts still images to moving image data and sends it to the central controller via a line of communication

Fujimoto discloses: a network camera that converts still images to moving image data and sends it to the central controller via a line of communication (“the entire hall of a ... facility is watched with a single or plural monitoring video cameras”, Fujimoto, par. 7, lines 1-3; i.e., video cameras capture moving image data; “a system control computer 7, an employee's card device 8, and a video camera 9, all connected each other with a network (such as a LAN)”, par. 62, lines 6-9; “embodiment is provided with a moving mechanism to change the photographing direction and a mechanism to take pictures in response to remote controlled photographing instruction from the system control computer 7”, Fujimoto, par. 191). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the laundry management system disclosed by Kuroda to include networked video cameras connected to a central controller, as disclosed by Fujimoto. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to modify the system of Kuroda in this way, since the networked video monitoring would permit the laundry

machine owner to monitor abnormal, wrong, or illegal acts (Fujimoto, par. 2, lines 3-4).

Although Fujimoto does not directly pertain to the field of coin laundry devices, a reference in a field different from that of applicant's endeavor may be reasonably pertinent if it is one which, because of the matter with which it deals, logically would have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering his or her invention as a whole (MPEP 2141.01). The prior art of record provides common essential elements, including networked video monitoring connected to a central system, even though the prior art does not pertain to coin laundry, but rather game-related devices. Furthermore, the element disclosed by Fujimoto solves the pertinent problem (i.e., remote device/facility monitoring). Additionally, the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. In the remarks, Applicant specifically addresses the following:

- 35 USC 103 Rejection to Claim 1, as obvious over Kuroda in view of Fujimoto

11. Regarding claim 1, Applicant asserts the following:

- "Fujimoto does not disclose that the video camera 'converts still images to moving image data'" (Remarks, p.6). Examiner respectfully disagrees. A video camera inherently

captures a continuous series of still images at a rate high enough so as to provide "moving" image data.

- "Fujimoto's recitation of a LAN connection merely suggests local monitoring of the facility, as opposed to monitoring from a site other than the coin laundry store" (Remarks, p. 5). Fujimoto was cited for teaching the recited limitation of "a network camera that converts still images to moving image data and sends it". Fujimoto clearly teaches a network video camera ("the entire hall of a ... facility is watched with a single or plural monitoring *video cameras*", Fujimoto, par. 7, lines 1-3; i.e., video cameras capture moving image data; "a system control computer 7, an employee's card device 8, and a video camera 9, all connected each other with a *network* (such as a LAN)", par. 62, lines 6-9). Additionally, Fujimoto clearly teaches remote monitoring ("embodiment is provided with a moving mechanism to change the photographing direction and a mechanism to take pictures in response to *remote controlled photographing* instruction from the system control computer 7", Fujimoto, par. 191).
- "the combined teachings of Kuroda and Fujimoto are away from the subject matter of claim 1, which recites that 'the central control device [is] located at a site other than the coin laundry store'" (Remarks, p. 5). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kuroda discloses remote monitoring ("a *remote* management system that makes it possible to change data stored in a memory in a control device of a machine which stores related data to the operation of the machine from a remote central control apparatus of a management company, without dispatching personnel to the site of the machine", Kuroda, col. 2, lines 36-41; "*remotely* managing a machine by means of a central control apparatus such as a

personal computer or the like by connecting the machine controlled by a *control device*, e.g., a micro-computer with the central control apparatus via *communication means*", Kuroda, col. 1, lines 8-13), and Fujimoto also discloses remote monitoring ("embodiment is provided with a moving mechanism to change the photographing direction and a mechanism to take pictures in response to *remote controlled photographing* instruction from the system control computer 7", Fujimoto, par. 191).

- "Fujimoto provides no teaching or suggestion that capture modes can be switched in response to a condition inside or outside the store" (Remarks, p. 5). Examiner notes that this limitation is not recited anywhere in the claim.
- "Fujimoto does not disclose that images captured by a video camera are transmitted outside the facility where the camera is located, and thus the images cannot be viewed in real time outside of the facility. To the Applicant, it seems that with Fujimoto's teachings, the captured images are stored at the facility where the camera is located, for review not in real time, but at a later time, in conjunction with the preservation of evidence in the case of wrongdoing" (Remarks, p. 6). In response to applicant's arguments against the Fujimoto reference individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SCOTT A. MATTIA whose telephone number is (571)270-7787. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM..
15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAN MOONEYHAM can be reached on (571)272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. A. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3689

/Dennis Ruhl/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689